Case 8:11-cv-00160-AW Document 55-37 Filed 04/04/13 Page 1 of 1 DEPOSITION OF CHARLES ALBERT EROH, P.E.

CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2012

38 (Pages 149 to 152)

149 151 4 A. Yes. Q. Okav. On what basis in your opinions do you 1 2 2 determine that Austin Mohawk is responsible from a Q. What did Austin Mohawk in particular do or 3 safety or OSHA enforcement standpoint for the happening ŝ not do that causes it to be responsible for the of the incident that we're here for today? You've used 4 4 happening of the incident and the damages to Meltech? 5 them both interchangeably. I'm talking specifically 5 A. Their biggest responsibility was not 6 about Austin Mobawk. б notifying the contractor Meltech that they were going 7 7) A. I don't think Austin -- I'm sorry. Could you to utilize a sub, White Construction. 8 repeat the question so I make sure that I understand 8 O. But Austin Mohawk didn't install it. It was 9 9 Beechgrove. And they specifically in the 10 Q. Well, first of all - and I'm sorry. Let me 10 contract identify --11 pull back for a second. 11 MR. MAHAFFEY: I'm going to object. That's, 12 What is the specific basis of your opinions 12 I think, two questions together. 13 13 in this case? Is it with regard to contractual MR. GARLAND: Okav. I'll separate it out. 14 interpretation, with regard to OSHA violations, with 14 But that was actually a statement. You would have 15 15 regard to basic safety issues? objected because it wasn't a question. 16 16 A. Regard to OSHA violations, basic safety MR, MAHAFFEY: I was about to do that. 17 issues, and my experience and understanding of the 17 BY MR. GARLAND: 18 construction industry. 18 Q. So -- and again, I don't want to confuse you, 19 Q. And you're not giving an interpretation or an 19 but if the contract between Austin Mohawk and Meltech 20 analysis of the contracts between the parties? 20 specifically said offload and install by Beechgrove 21 21 A. Absolutely not. Construction. Inc., what responsibility does Austin 22 22 Q. Okay. On what basis did you determine that Mohawk have for the installation -150 152 1 Austin Mohawk is responsible for the happening of this 1 A. They basically identify Beechgrove as their 2 2 incident and the damages that are claimed by Meltech? erector of choice. 3 A. Based on construction industry practice, the 3 Q. Okay. And then Meltech gets into a separate 4 fabricator, Austin Mohawk and Beechgrove, were 4 contract with Beechgrove, Inc., to do the installation, 5 basically hired by Meltech to fabricate and install the 5 correct? 6 6 canopy. A. Again, I haven't seen the contracts. ij 7 Q. Okay. And Austin Mohawk was the fabricator, Q. But don't contractual responsibilities - and 8 correct? 8 I'm not asking you to analyze legal effects of 9 A. It's my understanding, yes. 9 contracts - but don't contractual responsibilities and 10 Q. And you read the subcontract agreements? 10 undertakings affect a determination of what role a 11 11 party has with regard to OSHA responsibilities? 12 Q. And if you need to, it's Krishack 35. I 12 A. Again, OSHA specifically states that some --13 13 think 35A is a good copy of it if you have it. But it some things aren't assignable even through contract in 14 specifically, in the Austin Mohawk contract, 14 their multiple-employer citation. 15 specifically indicates in Article 2 that they will 15 Q. And OSHA didn't cite either Austin Mohawk or 16 16 deliver only; offload and install by Beechgrove Beechgrove, did it? 17 Construction, Inc., correct? 17 A. No. They weren't on-site. 1.8 A. I haven't reviewed the contracts. I'm not 18 Q. Right. 19 19 the attorney. A. And so they wouldn't have been part of OSHA's 20 Q. Okay. Well, you have to know what the 20 evaluation. 21 responsibilities of the parties are in order to make a 21 Q. Okay. And that should be determinative. 22 determination of fault, correct? 22 correct, as to whether or not Austin Mohawk or